

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****AUG 08 2005**

Application No. : 09/651,159
Filing Date : August 30, 2000
Inventors : Ole Bentz
Title : Overflow Detection and Clamping with Parallel Operand Processing for
Fixed-Point Multipliers
Examiner : Chat C. Do
Art Unit : 2193
Attorney Docket : MTI-31072 (15225-0011)
Confirmation No. : 2115
Customer No. : 31870

CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a) and 1.10

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

Mailing

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

☐ with sufficient postage as first class mail

☐ As "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" Mailing Label No.

Transmission

☒ transmitted by facsimile to Fax No. 571-273-8300 addressed to Examiner Chat C. Do at the Patent and Trademark Office.

Date: 8/8/2005Elyse R. V. [Signature]

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

Dear Sir:

Introductory Comments begin on:	page 2 of 16
Amended Claims begin on:	page 3 of 16
Remarks begin on:	page 12 of 16
Conclusion begins on:	page 15 of 16
Extension of Time begins on	page 16 of 16
Replacement Drawing Sheet is in:	Attachment A (FIGS. 1-2)

1037563v1

Application No. 09/651,159

RESPONSE AFTER FINAL

INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS

After careful review, Applicant hereby responds to a May 6, 2005 Final Office Action, regarding the above-referenced patent application. In view of this Response, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application.

Applicant has not added new matter with this Response and intends the scope of the invention and claims to be the same before and after this Response. Indeed, Applicant only offers this Response to clarify the invention for the Examiner and to assist the Examiner's understanding of the same. More specifically, Applicant has not intended this Response to effectuate a narrowing of the claims, foreclose techniques that are not reasonably foreseeable at this time, or effect the applicability and scope of the Doctrine of Equivalents.